

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/735,392	HANNAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	M. Safavi	3637	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) M. Safavi. (3) H. Hannawa.
 (2) M. Stewart. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 September 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: model of form panel & Brochure showing form and use thereof.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: JP 10-292624 & Langkamp et al. '552.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MICHAEL SAFAVI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 354

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Stewart had expressed that the claim language would be amended to set forth the feature of a "monolithic" or "single material" aspect of the claimed form and had suggested that such language would be part of a product-by-process language format emphasizing the monolithic nature of the claimed form. Examiner had not indicated whether such would read over the applied prior art but did state that the language to "monolithic" or "single material" appears to read over what is shown by the JP '624 reference. .